

**RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111**  
U.S. Application No. 10/825,675

**Q80118**

**REMARKS**

**Formalities**

Claims 1-14 are all the claims currently pending in this Application.

In the current Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges Applicants' claim of foreign priority and the receipt of the certified copy of the priority document. With the Office Action, the Examiner returns signed and initialed copies of the PTO-SB-08 Forms submitted with Applicants' IDSs of April 16, 2004, May 26, 2004, February 24, 2005, and July 6, 2005.

**Claim Rejections**

Claims 1, 7, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Sasaki, JP 07-281293 ("Sasaki"). Claims 2-6 and 8-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Sasaki, in view of Dewald, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0008470 ("Dewald").

Applicants submit that Sasaki fails to disclose or suggest the claimed light source. The Examiner refers to the cathode ray tube 1 of Sasaki as disclosing the claimed light source. However, the cathode ray tube of Sasaki emits light corresponding to a picture having a predetermined aspect ratio. However, the light emitted from the claimed light source does not have an aspect ratio.

Applicants also submit that Sasaki fails to disclose or suggest the claimed light integrator which converts light emitted from the light source to have uniform optical intensity. The Examiner refers to the lens 2 of Sasaki as disclosing this limitation. However, there is no

**RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111**  
U.S. Application No. 10/825,675**Q80118**

disclosure or suggestion in Sasaki that the lens could convert light emitted from a light source to have uniform optical intensity, as claimed.

Applicants also submit that Sasaki fails to disclose or suggest the claimed aspect ratio conversion unit, which transmits light emitted from the integrator that does not correspond to an aspect ratio of image information back to the integrator, and converts and emits incident light to correspond to the aspect ratio of the image information. The light shield 5 of Sasaki protects against a flare caused by an aberration in a lens 2. According to Sasaki, because the light emitted from the cathode ray tube has a predetermined aspect ratio, there is no need to convert light emitted from the cathode ray tube to a predetermined aspect ratio and there is therefore no element for that purpose. Additionally, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Sasaki regarding reflecting light which does not correspond to a predetermined aspect ratio, as claimed.

Additionally, regarding Claim 7, the Examiner asserts that the cathode ray tube of Sasaki corresponds to the claimed optical modulator. As discussed above, the Examiner also refers to the cathode ray tube of Sasaki as corresponding to the claimed light source. According to Claim 7, however, the illumination unit comprises a light source, an integrator and an aspect ratio conversion unit, and the optical modulator modulates light emitted from the illumination unit. However, if the light source and the optical modulator are one and the same (the cathode ray tube of Sasaki, as suggested by the Examiner), the optical modulator (the cathode ray tube, as suggested) could not possibly modulate light that had been emitted from the light source (the cathode ray tube, as suggested) and thereafter converted by the integrator (the lens 1, external to the cathode ray tube, as suggested).

**RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111**  
U.S. Application No. 10/825,675**Q80118**

Applicants further submit that Dewald also fails to teach or suggest an aspect ratio conversion unit, as claimed.

Additionally, Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the presently-claimed invention would not have been motivated to combine Sasaki and Dewald as suggested by the Examiner because there is no suggestion of motivation for doing so in the references themselves or the knowledge available to one of ordinary skill in the art without resorting to impermissible hindsight. As discussed above, Sasaki teaches a cathode ray tube, which emits light which has a set aspect ratio and which corresponds to an image to be displayed. Thus, even assuming *arguendo* that the integrating rod 300 and the mirror 306 of Dewald taught an integrator and an aspect ratio conversion unit, as claimed, one of skill in the art at the time of the invention would not have been motivated to replace the lens 2 and light shield 5 of Sasaki with the integrating rod 300 and mirror 306 of Dewald. If the integrating rod of Dewald were used in conjunction with the cathode ray tube of Sasaki, the light from the cathode ray tube would be mixed in the integrating rod, and therefore would not be displayed properly. Therefore, because of the disparity between these two references, the only possible motivation for the Examiner's proposed combination is Applicants' own disclosure, the reliance on which constitutes impermissible hindsight reconstruction under MPEP §2143 (see also *In re Vaeck*, 20 USPQ 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991)).

Therefore, Applicants submit that Sasaki fails to anticipate Claims 1, 7, and 14, and that Claims 2-6 and 8-13 are patentable over any reasonable combination of the cited references.

**RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111**  
U.S. Application No. 10/825,675

**Q80118**


Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of these claims be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Laura Moskowitz  
Registration No. 55,470

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 21, 2006

**CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION**

Sir;

I hereby certify that the above identified correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to Examiner **Andrew T. SEVER** at the Patent and Trademark Office on **February 21, 2006** at **571-273-8300 (Central Fax)**.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Laura Moskowitz